DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 866 JC 010 186

TITLE	Institutional Effectiveness Report, 1998-99.
INSTITUTION	Houston Community Coll. System, TX. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	2000-08-00
NOTE	58p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Institutional Evaluation; *Institutional Mission; Labor Force Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Strategic Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Houston Community College System TX

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the institutional effectiveness of the Houston Community College System for the 1998-1999 fiscal year. Part 1 describes the institution's progress toward eight strategic goals outlined in 1996-97: promoting student success, improving student access, ensuring responsive curricula, building new and varied partnerships, strengthening institutional resources, increasing technological capability, expanding community outreach, and demonstrating continuous improvement. Tables illustrate the overall status of each goal. It appears that the objective to increase by 50% the number of certificates and degrees awarded seems to have been too ambitious. Also, additional work must be done to expand community outreach. Part 2 identifies seven indicators that are critical in measuring the institution's effectiveness in fulfilling its mission: access and equity, student progress/satisfaction, workforce programs, university transfer, lifelong learning, cultural activities, and institutional support. The performance of each of these indicators is evaluated with a rating of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Overall, HCC's performance is not as satisfactory as it was in the last report, and there is cause for concern in the area of institutional support and the downward trend that the data present. Finally, part 3 summarizes the status of the educational program review process. (MP)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 866

1998-99 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT

Status Report for Year Two:

- **Vision for the Future**
- **Critical Success Indicators and Performance Measures**
- **Educational Program Review Activities**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret Drain

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC010186

HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Houston Community College System
1998-99 Institutional Effectiveness Report

Published by the Office of Institutional Research
August 2000

Houston Community College System does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the *1998-99 Institutional Effectiveness Report* is to "close the loop" by providing feedback to the administration and Board regarding HCCS' institutional effectiveness efforts for the fiscal year 1998-99.

Part I is a status report on the institution's progress toward accomplishing its eight strategic goals as outlined in *Vision for the Future*. Progress continued to be made on all eight goals with the implementation of Year Two strategies. Most significant is the work that has been done to strengthen institutional resources (in particular, through improved facilities) and to increase technological capability. Since 1997, work has been completed on the Stafford and Eastside extensions, the initial building of the Northeast Complex and the Health Careers Center. In addition, newly purchased or lease/purchase facilities have become operational, including the West Loop Center, the Town and Country Square Campus, and the Pinemont Center. The capacity for increased technology has been incorporated into all these facilities and also into plans for further development of the colleges' infrastucture. The number of open access computers has increased 425 percent system-wide.

While there are still a number of strategies that remain to be carried out, there are several areas for concern if HCCS is to fulfill its established goals for 1997-2000. As stated in last year's report, the objective to promote student success by increasing by 50 percent the number of certificates and degrees awarded seems to have been too ambitious. While the number of degrees awarded has risen by 3 percent in 1998-99 compared to 1997-98, the number of certificates has decreased considerably and the reason(s) is not clear. This remains a key area for concern. Also, additional work needs to be done to expand community outreach. Since the position of Executive Director of International Initiatives was filled in 1998-99, it can be expected that the number of international partnerships will increase during 1999-2000.

Part II is a status report on the institution's performance in seven areas identified as critical to its success. Overall, HCCS' performance is not as satisfactory as it was in the last report. There are five areas in which performance is less than satisfactory. In the area of access and equity, enrollment in continuing education and noncredit programs continued to drop; in student progress/student satisfaction, the number of degrees and certificates awarded in 1998-99 falls below the baseline; in the area of economic development and lifelong learning, enrollment in ABE, GED, ESL and workplace literacy programs declined; under cultural and cross-cultural activities, much work needs to be done in 1999-2000 to increase the number of international partnerships. Finally, there is cause for concern in the area of institutional support and the downward trend which data present. This could be attributed in part to the opening of new facilities; however, reductions in contact hours taught by full-time faculty and other reductions need to be analyzed and appropriate actions taken.

Part III is a summary report on the status of the educational program review process. By the end of year two, nearly 50 percent of the institution's workforce and academic programs completed self-evaluations. More importantly, all of the pilot workforce programs developed and implemented improvement plans to address deficiencies identified in 1997-98. Changes have been made as a result. Purpose statements are in place where found missing. A "recent alumni" and an "employer" survey are being implemented by the Office of Institutional Research to assist all programs in measuring customer satisfaction. The opening of new buildings and campuses during the year fulfilled the need for improved classroom and laboratory facilities for many of our programs. There should continue to be evidence of change in the quality of the educational program as the review process continues and the results are used for program improvement.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary ..... *ii*

Committees for Institutional Planning and Evaluation ..... *iv*

Introduction 1

Part I. Status Report on ***Vision for the Future*** at the End of Year Two (1998-99) 2

Vision for the Future: Strategic Plan Outcomes for Year Two (1998-99) 6

Part II. Status Report on Critical Success Indicators and Performance Measures at the End of Year Two (1998-99) 14

Critical Success Indicators and Performance for Year Two (1998-99) 16

Part III. Report on Educational Program Review Activities for 1998-99 24

Academic Program Review Status for 1998-99 25

Workforce Program Review Status for 1998-99 27

COMMITTEES FOR INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ruth Burgos-Sasscer	Chancellor, *Ex Officio*
Patricia C. Williamson	Vice Chancellor Institutional Development, *Chair*
Charles Hebert, Jr.	Associate Vice Chancellor Workforce Development
Charles Cook	Vice Chancellor Educational Development
Jim Vasquez	Chair, Information Technology Steering Committee
Margaret Drain	Acting Chair, Institutional Effectiveness Committee

College Representatives

Zach Hodges	President, Northwest
Jackie Mullis	Administration, Northeast
Bill Askew	Faculty, Northwest
Dorothy Lewis	Faculty, Southwest
Johnella Bradford	Faculty, Southeast
Jackie Howard	Professional, Northeast
Sandra LaFever	Support Staff, Central
Martin Houg	Counselor, Central
Ray Garay	Counselor, Southeast
Dennis Klappersack	Librarian, Southwest

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE

Margaret Drain	Acting Director Institutional Research, *Chair*
Celia Gee	Administrative Services
Fena Garza	Educational Development
Charles Hebert, Jr.	Workforce Development
John Brown	Central College
Dan Richards	Northeast College
Mary Alice Wills	Northwest College
Jean Vining	Southeast College
Arnold Goldberg	Southwest College

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the *1998-99 Institutional Effectiveness Report* is to again "close the loop" by providing feedback to the members of the administration and the Board regarding HCCS' institutional effectiveness efforts for the fiscal year 1998-99. The Office of Institutional Research, in collaboration with the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness committees, is charged with the responsibility for reporting on institutional effectiveness activities. It is the role of the Chancellor's Council to use the information in this report as a basis for making decisions and initiating actions that will make HCCS more effective in fulfilling its mission and in implementing its goals and objectives.

This report is divided into three parts. Part I summarizes the institution's progress toward accomplishing its *Vision for the Future* at the end the 1998-99 fiscal year and Part II the institution's performance in the seven critical success areas. Part III summarizes evidence of change resulting from the pilot workforce program reviews and the status of the workforce programs and academic disciplines that were evaluated during 1998-99. Tables showing the review status are included in Part III.

The assessments in this document were developed by Dr. Pat Williamson, Chair of the Planning Committee, Dr. David Ugwu, Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, members of the Committee, and Lady Huffaker, Institutional Research Technician. Assessments for Part I and Part II were formed by comparing data collected by the Office of Institutional Research and its liaisons for Year Two with baseline and Year One data established for both the planning goals/objectives and the critical success indicators/performance measures. Included with the overall assessments are two supporting documents: "A Vision for the Future: Strategic Plan Outcomes for Year Two (1998-99)" and "Critical Success Indicators and Performance for Year Two (1998-99)." The strategic planning document provides objectives for accomplishing the established goals; the performance measures document identifies seven indicators or areas of inquiry deemed critical to measuring the institution's success in fulfilling its mission and implementing its goals. Both documents include all baseline and Year One and Year Two data. These data report the degree of effectiveness with which HCCS achieves its goals and fulfills its mission and provide the basis for the new strategic plan being developed for 2000-2003.

PART I:
STATUS REPORT ON *VISION FOR THE FUTURE* AT THE END OF YEAR TWO (1998-99)

During 1996-97, the Chancellor and the Chancellor's Council developed its *Vision for the Future*, establishing eight strategic goals to focus the institution's efforts over the course of the succeeding three years. Objectives for accomplishing these goals ***by 2000*** were also established.

This part of the *Institutional Effectiveness Report* is an assessment of the outcomes of Year Two planning and a summary of HCCS' progress in accomplishing its *Vision for the Future* goals and objectives from September 1998 through August 1999.

Goal 1. **Promote Student Success**—***By 2000, the institution will increase the number of certificates and degrees by 50%, meet or exceed the state community college average for university transfer and job placement rates, and establish a counselor/student ratio of 1/1,200.***

Overall Status of Goal 1: While the number of degrees awarded increased slightly, the number certificates dropped by nearly 30 percent for 1998-99. However, 17 new Workforce certificates were approved by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board in 1998-99, and the number of awards should increase as students complete those programs in preparation for new opportunities in the workforce. The institution is within 0.2 percent of meeting the average transfer rate for the state and exceeds the current state average for job placement by 4.7 percent. The counselor/student ratio continues to exceed the established minimum.

Goal 2. **Improve Student Access**—***By 2000, the institution will increase by 25% the number of students enrolled in nontraditional format courses, increase annually by 10% the number of GED graduates who enroll in credit courses at HCCS the following year, enroll a percentage of ethnic minority students to equal or exceed the percentage in the service area; and, in its staffing, the institution will reflect the demographics of the Houston community.***

Overall Status of Goal 2: The overall enrollment of students in nontraditional format courses increased by 19 percent from baseline by the end of Year Two. This increase is attributable to the number of distance education students, which has grown by 46 percent over the last two years. In regard to increasing the enrollment of students with GEDs as stated in Objective 2.2, this objective is not measurable because HCCS does not produce GED graduates but prepares students for GED testing. Therefore, it may be more meaningful to measure the number of HCCS credit students who enter with a GED regardless of when the GED was achieved. With the full implementation of SPIN, this particular data will be available, as the institution will have the capability of identifying and tracking GED students.

The last two objectives for improving student access focus on HCCS' success in reflecting the ethnic make-up of its service area. In comparing the outcomes of Year Two with established baselines, there is a continued increase in the percentage of African-American and Asian students and 1.5 percent growth in Hispanic enrollment, bringing HCCS even more closely in line with its service area population. The demographics for the Houston community are closely reflected in HCCS' body of employees with one notable exception: the percentage of Hispanic faculty is 17.8 percent below the population percentage. Overall, the strategies for improving student access seem to be well planned and should continue to yield positive results.

Goal 3. **Ensure Responsive Curricula**—***By 2000, the institution will increase customized training by 50%, implement four new programs to meet workforce needs while eliminating four that are no longer viable, and implement a plan to periodically evaluate the curricula for all its educational programs.***

Overall Status of Goal 3: HCCS has continued its progress toward accomplishing its goal to ensure responsive curricula. The number of customized training contracts already exceeds the goal set for year 2000 by 20 percent. Four new technical programs have been implemented to meet workforce needs and two that no longer meet those needs eliminated. The program review process is helping identify programs that are no longer viable, and several more are under consideration for closure at this time. Therefore, through restructuring of the discipline committees, conducting comprehensive program reviews, and continuing to evaluate developmental studies, HCCS is showing its commitment to ensuring a curricula that is responsive to both student and business/industry needs.

Goal 4. **Build New and Varied Partnerships**—***By 2000, each college within the institution will develop a relationship with each high school and middle school in its service region and establish a minimum of one partnership with a local library. One hundred students will participate in American Reads due to institutional support of this literacy program. The institution will increase by 25% the number of business/industry partners who provide cooperative education experiences for workforce students and increase by 20% its agreements with four-year institutions.***

Overall Status of Goal 4: Reasonable progress has been made in enhancing educational opportunities at HCCS through expanding the institution's relationships with external constituencies. The total number of relationships between the colleges and service area schools has continued to increase. However, it would have been more meaningful if baseline data/annual outcomes had included the number of possible relationships within each college's service area. Similarly, all colleges had at least one local library relationship in the baseline year; therefore it would have been more appropriate to increase those relationships where possible. By the end of Year Two, HCCS reached 85 percent of its goal with America Reads, and continued to meet the desired increase in agreements with higher institutions. During 1998-99, Workforce Development designated responsibility for site-based education and co-op programs at each of the colleges, so it is reasonable to expect an increase in workplace opportunities for HCCS students by the end of 1999-2000.

Goal 5. **Strengthen Institutional Resources**—***By 2000, the institution will implement a Ten-Year Facilities Plan; complete extensions at Stafford, Eastside, and the initial building of Northeast Campus, and a Health Careers Center; and provide comprehensive library resources at each college. In addition, full-time faculty will teach 50% of HCCS' credit classes. Funds generated through scholarships and grants and other contributions will increase by 10%, and the HCCS Foundation will become financially self-sufficient.***

Overall Status of Goal 5: Tremendous progress has been made toward achieving greater operational efficiency and effectiveness within the institution. The Facilities Master Plan has been developed; all of the strategies concerning facilities Objective 5.2 have been completed through 1998-99. The Stafford extension was completed in 1997-98, and the initial building of the new Northeast complex and the Health Careers Center and the Eastside expansion were completed by the beginning of Fall 1999. Likewise, plans for expanding library resources continue to progress, as evidenced by completion of phase one and two of the automation project and the development and implementation of a system-wide library plan that includes targets for personnel, facilities, and collections for each college.

Although faculty resources were strengthened by 60 additional full-time faculty in 1997-98, the number of contact hours taught by full-time faculty is still somewhat below the desired 50 percent. The Chancellor's Executive Team continues to give priority status to faculty hiring. Program review documentation is being used to help identify and prioritize needs for faculty and the allocation of full-time positions. The objective to increase Federal, state, and other grant funding activities by 10 percent was met and surpassed in 1998-99 for an overall 17 percent increase from the baseline amount. The HCCS Foundation continues to show a steady increase in the amount of funds generated annually, making significant progress towards becoming financially self-sufficient.

Goal 6. **Increase Technological Capability**—***By 2000, the institution will implement its strategic plan for technology, complete its data network infrastructure at all permanent locations and provide open access computers at each college for faculty and student use during college service hours.***

Overall Status of Goal 6: With the exception of the number of open access computers per college, no baselines were needed for this goal. Strategies for accomplishing this goal appear to be well thought out, and progress was made as expected for both Year One and Year Two. In addition to completing technological activities targeted for 1997-98, the institution has revised hiring policies to be more competitive and filled several vacant IT positions, completed the renovation plan at Washington and started plans for 3100 Main to support IT functions, and facilitated development and prioritization of the colleges' infrastructure plan. The number of open access computers increased an astounding 425 percent systemwide by the end of Year Two; the focus is now on developing a student/faculty to computer ratio.

Goal 7. **Expand Community Outreach**—***By 2000, the institution will conduct a workforce needs assessment in all areas where new facilities are planned, create and disseminate an HCCS experts list to the community, and increase by 50% the number of international partnerships.***

Overall Status of Goal 7: By the end of Year Two, needs assessments were completed for the 288 area, Uptown Houston, and the Medical Center; two additional assessments for the new Northeast area and Eastside are in progress. Work has been initiated to create an HCCS Experts List, which should be ready for distribution by Fall 2000. An Executive Director of International Initiatives was hired in 1998-99. The Director redefined "international partnerships" and identified 11 international partnerships in existence at the time of hiring. However, strategies for Year Three are underway and the number of international partnerships should increase significantly by the end of this strategic planning period.

Goal 8. **Demonstrate Continuous Improvement**—***By 2000, the institution's full-time employees will participate in at least three job-related professional development activities per year to include technological training. The institution will provide opportunities for professional development for part-time personnel. In addition, the institution will develop and implement an institutional effectiveness plan and use the results for institutional improvement, and also implement recommendations from the Workforce Focus Group for improving technical education programs.***

Overall Status of Goal 8: No baseline data were required for the three objectives the institution established for this goal. Furthermore, a method for documenting the number of full-time employees participating in three professional development activities per year has

not yet been finalized. However, forms for reporting such activities are due at the same time as the annual employee performance evaluations and are submitted to Human Resources Records Department. The Employee Development Services Department, which was established in 1997-98, implemented an Employee Technology Training Plan in 1998-99, increasing professional development opportunities for both full-time and part-time employees.

The institution has implemented an Institutional Effectiveness (IE) plan that is providing positive results. During 1998-99, college-level Institutional Effectiveness committees were formed to facilitate planning and evaluation activities in their respective areas. Under the guidance of system- and college-level IE committees, all units across the system developed purpose statements, goals, objectives and performance measures. Representatives from all levels of the institution again evaluated progress toward achievement of the 1997-2000 goals and objectives, reviewed the strategic plan and suggested new strategies as needed. The system-level IE Committee evaluated the institution's performance for Year Two, which is included in Part II of this report, based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. Recommendations from the Workforce Focus Group for improving technical programs continue to be implemented through the IE process and the Program Review component.

In summary, the institution has established a plan to assess institutional effectiveness, including procedures to ensure use of results for institutional improvement. An annual assessment of institutional effectiveness activities, such as this report, will continue to provide valuable information for immediate planning and budgetary decision making and for future planning.

Houston Community College System

A Vision for the Future

Strategic Plan Outcomes for Year Two (1998-99)

GOAL 1. PROMOTE STUDENT SUCCESS

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 1.1 The number of certificates & degrees awarded will increase by 50%.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
1,086 Degrees 1,102 Certificates 2,188 Total Awards	1,040 Degrees 1,096 Certificates 2,136 Total Awards	1,072 Degrees 771 Certificates 1, 843 Total Awards	

Objective 1.2a Transfer rates will meet or exceed the state community college average.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS 25.8% State Avg. 27.7%	HCCS 28.1% State Avg. 28.2%	HCCS 28.8% State Avg. 29.0%	

Objective 1.2b Job placement rates will meet or exceed the state community college average.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS 85.00% State Avg. 79.72%	HCCS 85.4% State Avg. 83.2%	HCCS 86.6% State Avg. 84.0%	

Objective 1.3 The ratio of full-time counselors to students will be 1/1,200.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Counselor/Student Ratio = 1/1,204	Counselor/Student Ratio = 1/1,173	Counselor/Student Ratio = 1/1,165	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOAL 2. IMPROVE STUDENT ACCESS

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 2.1 **Increase by 25% the number of students enrolled in courses offered in nontraditional formats (i.e. distance learning, flex entry, weekends).**

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Distance Education = 6,163 Flex Entry = 24,375 Weekends = 10,621	Distance Education = 7,303 Flex Entry = 22,319 Weekends = 12,113	Distance Education = 8,995 Flex Entry = 24,453 Weekends = 15,432	

Objective 2.2 **Increase annually by 10% the number of HCCS G.E.D. graduates who enroll the following year in HCCS credit courses.**

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Fall '97 = 125 students from HCCS classes (out of 4,576)	Fall '98 = 121 students from HCCS classes (out of 4,120)	Fall '99 = 205 students from HCCS classes (out of 2,686)	

Objective 2.3 **The percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled in credit courses will equal or exceed the percentage in the service area population at large.**

Baseline Data 1996-97						*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*						*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*						*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
	W	B	H	A	O		W	B	H	A	O		W	B	H	A	O	
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%		Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%		Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%		
HCCS	39.8%	22.7%	22.5%	14.1%	0.8%	HCCS	38.8%	23.0%	23.2%	13.8%	1.2%	HCCS	35.9%	23.7%	24.0%	14.9%	1.6%	

Objective 2.4 **The demographics of faculty, staff and administrators will reflect the demographics of the Houston community.**

Baseline Data 1996-97					*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*					*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*					*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
	W	B	H	A/O		W	B	H	A/O		W	B	H	A/O	
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	
Faculty	63.4%	22.2%	7.7%	6.8%	Faculty	63.2%	22.1%	7.8%	7.0%	Faculty	63.7%	21.7%	8.0%	6.7%	
Admin.	56.7%	22.5%	18.3%	2.5%	Admin.	55.2%	21.9%	20.0%	2.9%	Admin.	55.2%	26.7%	15.2%	2.9%	
Staff	36.5%	35.8%	21.0%	6.7%	Staff	34.7%	35.3%	23.4%	6.6%	Staff	34.0%	36.1%	23.2%	6.7%	

GOAL 3. ENSURE RESPONSIVE CURRICULA

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 3.1 Increase by 50% the number of customized training contracts.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Customized Training Contracts=95	Customized Training Contracts=179	Customized Training Contracts=163	

Objective 3.2 Develop and implement four (4) new technical programs that meet regional workforce needs.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Programs Implemented=3	Programs Implemented=1	

Objective 3.3 Eliminate four (4) programs that no longer meet regional workforce needs.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	One Eliminated = Upholstery	One Eliminated = Office Occupations (changed to Cont Ed)	

Objective 3.4 Develop and implement a plan to periodically evaluate all curricula.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	**Pilot Program Reviews** Workforce Programs Evaluated = 9 Academic Disciplines Participated in Pilot = 8 (Evaluation Incomplete)	**Fall 98 Program Reviews** Workforce Programs Evaluated = 25 Academic Disciplines Evaluated =12	

GOAL 4. BUILD NEW AND VARIED PARTNERSHIPS

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 4.1 Each college will develop a relationship with each high school and middle school in its service region.

Baseline Data 1996-97			*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*			*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*			*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
	# Relationships	Dual Enrollment		# Relationships	Dual Enrollment		# Relationships	Dual Enrollment	
CEN	4	0	CEN	5	0	CEN	12	0	
SE	9	62	SE	9	0	SE	8	0	
SW	17	86	SW	17	64	SW	20	31	
NE	4	87	NE	14	136	NE	14	39	
NW	13	1,276	NW	15	1,548	NW	16	1,438	
Tech Prep Partnerships=50			Tech Prep Partnerships=54			Tech Prep Partnerships=54			

Objective 4.2 One hundred (100) students will participate in "America Reads" literacy program.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	63 Students	85 Students	

Objective 4.3 Increase by 25% the number of business/industry partners who will provide cooperative education opportunities for our students.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
437 Sites	475 Sites	475 Sites	

Objective 4.4 Each college will establish a minimum of one (1) partnership with a local library to enhance resources for its students.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	All Colleges Meet Minimum.	All Colleges Meet Minimum.	

Objective 4.5 Increase by 20% agreements with four-year institutions.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Agreements with 4-Year Institutions = 23	Agreements with 4-Year Institutions = 29	Agreements with 4-Year Institutions = 29	

GOAL 5. STRENGTHEN INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 5.1 The Career Health Center, the Northeast Campus and the Eastside Campus and Stafford extensions will be completed and operational.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Stafford Extension Completed	Eastside Extension Completed; Initial Building of Northeast Campus and Health Careers Center Completed	

Objective 5.2 A Ten-Year Facilities Plan will be implemented which focuses on consolidating and purchasing operational sites for greater cost efficiency and instructional effectiveness.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress	Plan Developed, Implementation In Progress	

Objective 5.3 Each college will provide comprehensive library and learning resources.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress	In Progress	

Objective 5.4 Full-time faculty will teach 50% of credit classes.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Contact Hours taught by FT Faculty = 46.3%	Hours taught by FT Faculty = 46.6%	Contact Hours taught by FT Faculty = 43.9%	

Objective 5.5 The HCCS Foundation will become financially self-sufficient.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
1996-97 Budget=$102,220 1996-97 Funds Generated=$267,915	1997-98 Budget=$142,793 1997-98 Funds Generated=$325,138	1998-99 Budget=$140,276 1998-99 Funds Generated=$395,430 *(unaudited)*	

Objective 5.6 Increase by 10% funding and other contributions from public and private sources.

Baseline Data 1996-97		*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*		*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*		*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Federal grants	$7,262,670	Federal grants	$7,728,292	Federal grants	$7,812,843	
State grants	1,066,862	State grants	1,564,312	State grants	1,886,619	
Other grants	567,582	Other grants	366,462	Other grants	737,570	
	$8,897,114		$9,659,066		$10,437,032	
Foundation	267,915	Foundation	325,138	Foundation	395,430 *(unaudited)*	
Total	$9,165,029	Total	$9,984,204	Total	$10,832,462	

GOAL 6. INCREASE TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITY

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 6.1 The Strategic Plan for Technology will be updated and implemented according to schedule.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress	In Progress	

Objective 6.2 The data network infrastructure to support information and instructional technologies will be completed at all permanent locations.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress	In Progress	

Objective 6.3 Open access computers will be available at each college for faculty, staff, and students during college service hours.

Baseline Data 1996-97		*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*		*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*		*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
College	**# Computers**	**College**	**# Computers**	**College**	**# Computers**	
CEN	69	CEN	98	CEN	371	
NE	99	NE	99	NE	224	
NW	89	NW	120	NW	688	
SE	156	SE	156	SE	390	
SW	63	SW	75	SW	559	

GOAL 7. EXPAND COMMUNITY OUTREACH

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 7.1 Conduct an assessment of education and workforce training needs in all areas where new facilities are planned.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Two Assessments Completed	One Assessment Complete; Two Assessments in Progress	

Objective 7.2 Create an HCCS Experts List and disseminate it to community groups.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	No Year One Data Needed	In Progress	

Objective 7.3 Increase by 50% the number of international partnerships.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
Total Partnerships = 19	Total Partnerships = 19	Total Partnerships = 11	

GOAL 8. DEMONSTRATE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

3-YEAR OBJECTIVES

Objective 8.1 Full-time employees will participate in at least three (3) job related professional development activities per year to include technological training.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	Data Not Yet Available	Data Not Yet Available	

Objective 8.2 The system will provide professional development opportunities for part-time employees and adjunct faculty.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	No Year One Data Needed	In Progress	

Objective 8.3 Develop and implement an institutional effectiveness plan and use the results for institutional improvement.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress	Plan Implemented and Use of Results In Progress	

Objective 8.4 Implement recommendations from the Workforce Focus Group for improving technical education programs.

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Outcomes Year One 1997-98*	*Outcomes Year Two 1998-99*	*Outcomes Year Three 1999-2000*
No Baseline Data Needed	In Progress	In Progress	

PART II.
STATUS REPORT ON CRITICAL SUCCESS INDICATORS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES AT THE END OF YEAR ONE (1998-99)

HCCS has identified seven indicators or areas of inquiry that are critical to the institution in measuring its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission and goals. Performance measures have been established for each critical area. Also, the institution has identified existing tools for measurement and continues to refine those tools and develop new tools where needed.

The following is a summary of HCCS' performance in the seven critical success areas for fiscal year 1998-1999.

Access and Equity—*Overall performance "Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory"*

Semester credit hour enrollment showed a nonsignificant increase (<1.0%) over baseline. However, enrollment in continuing education and noncredit programs continued to drop to a level that is more than 8.4 percent below the baseline value. Comparison of the student and service area population mix indicates the college population is a consistent reflection of the areas being served, the only exception being a 9.8 percent underrepresentation of White students and a 9.1 overrepresentation of Asian students. Comparing the population mix of faculty-staff-administrators to students shows a consistent underrepresentation of Hispanic and Asian/Other faculty (more than 16% and 9.8% respectively below the student population value). The number of economically disadvantaged students continues to decrease, while that of the academically disadvantaged continues to increase. In 1998-99, students receiving financial assistance dropped nearly 6 percent below baseline.

Student Progress/Student Satisfaction—*Overall performance "Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory"*

The percentage of remedial students tested and untested who pass all three sections of the TASP changed very slightly from 11.05 percent in Year One to 11 percent in Year Two, not a significant change. The percentage of Fall semester student course completers increased nearly 1 percent from 77.01 percent in Year One to 77.84 percent in Year Two, a positive change. The number of students who returned from Fall semester to enroll for Spring semester is up by 9.6 percent in Year Two from baseline to 69.7 percent in Year Two, a very positive change. Evaluation of overall quality of education is basically the same at 64.1 percent in Year Two. The measure of most concern in Year Two is the number of Associate degrees and certificates awarded, which for Year Two has deceased by 293 students or a 16 percent decrease in number of degrees and certificates awarded. Although this decline is not statistically significant, the decline warrants serious study to determine what measures the College System might take to prevent this decline from becoming a trend. Overall performance on the student progress/student satisfaction factor remains promising.

Workforce Programs—*Overall performance "Satisfactory Where Measurable"*

HCCS continues to rank more than 2 percent above the state average in job placement for workforce program graduates. The institution is now engaged in a process to measure employer and graduate satisfaction of workforce training/job preparation provided to students. Pilot surveys developed and implemented by the Office of Institutional Research should yield data for Year Three.

Performance on licensure exams is a difficult outcome to measure. According to the Institutional Effectiveness Measures and Standards for Texas Community and Technical Colleges, one measure of pass rate is that the percentage of students who take licensure exams and pass is not more than 5 percent below state average for last three years for the specific licensure exam. The THECB 1999 Statewide Licensure Report for HCCS lists 17 programs but only eight of those programs have complete data for the last three-year period. Of those eight programs, five meet the standard. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) data are currently the only

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

data available; however, THECB is dependent on licensing agency reports, which are not consistently available from these agencies. These data should be augmented by HCCS programs.

University Transfer—*Overall performance "Satisfactory Where Measurable"*

The trend of HCCS students transferring to four-year institutions continues to show an increase over the baseline. Where statistical data is available, the GPAs of HCCS transfer students compare favorably with the GPAs of all transfer students in a sample of large, medium, and local institutions. HCCS has difficulty obtaining adequate and reliable data from selected institutions comparing the GPAs of HCCS transfer students with the GPAs of native students at those institutions. The HCCS Transfer Office continues to work on this issue with HCCS' top transfer institutions such as the University of Houston, the University of Texas, and Texas A. & M. University. To aid in developing university transfer measures, the Registrar's Office and the Office of Institutional Research are piloting a survey to measure graduate satisfaction with academic preparation. The survey is designed to be completed on site by the student at the same time the student is finalizing his or her degree plan for graduation.

Economic Development and Lifelong Learning—*Overall performance "Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory"*

Enrollment in ABE, GED, ESL, and workplace literacy programs in Year Two declined 23 percent. Because this is a dramatic drop in enrollment, it is an area of concern. Facilities may have to be addressed in analyzing the reason for the decrease in enrollment. The "number of companies and number of individuals served by industry contract training" needs to be changed to "number of companies served by contract training," in order to collect meaningful data. "Completion of noncredit courses for personal interest" shows no significant change and "successful completion of Workforce CEU courses" fluctuates by approximately .05 percent from year to year.

Cultural and Cross-Cultural Activities—*Overall performance "Unsatisfactory"*

The number of international partnerships reported for Year Two decreased based on the baseline established in 1996-97. However, the baseline data might not be accurate because the definition for such partnerships may not have been clearly defined. The newly appointed Executive Director for International Initiatives identified 11 partnerships in existence for 1998-99 and is working towards an increase based on that number. The total cultural and cross-cultural activities reported for Year Two is 150 or near baseline. However, whether the tool for counting such college-sponsored activities is accurate or not continues to be questionable.

Institutional Support—*Overall performance "Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory"*

THECB definition: Institutional support includes cost associated with executive management, fiscal operations, general administration and logistical services, administrative computing support, and public relations/development as defined by the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

The institution is performing satisfactorily in most areas of institutional support when comparing Year Two data with Year One and the established baselines. The effect of opening new facilities and the closing of facilities leased from independent school districts is not expected to show positive impact on space per full-time equivalent student until Year Three. Concerning restricted funds, there is a significant increase in the amount for Year Two when compared to Year One and the baseline data. The areas for concern are the reduction of contact hours taught by full-time faculty as well as on the decrease in expenditures per full-time equivalent students. The cause(s) for the reductions need to be analyzed and evaluated and appropriate action(s) taken. Although there is no significant decrease in the percentage of expenditures for institutional support versus total current funds expenditures, these data must be monitored closely and taken as a whole with the other reductions noted above.

Houston Community College System

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS—INSTITUTION-LEVEL

Critical Success Indicators and Performance for Year One (1998-99)

INDICATOR A. ACCESS AND EQUITY

Measure A.1 HCCS credit and noncredit Fall enrollment

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Semester Hour Credit = 38,362 Continuing Ed & Noncredit =15,355	Semester Hour Credit = 38,204 Continuing Ed & Noncredit = 14,991	Semester Hour Credit = 38,610 Continuing Ed & Noncredit = 14,058	

Measure A.2a Student Fall population mix compared to service area population

Baseline Data 1996-97	W	B	H	A	N Am	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
HCCS Student Pop Mix	39.8%	22.7%	22.5%	14.1%	0.3%	0.5%

Year One 1997-98	W	B	H	A	N Am	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
HCCS Student Pop Mix	38.8%	23.0%	23.2%	13.8%	0.3%	0.9%

Year Two 1998-99	W	B	H	A	N Am	O
Srvc Area	45.7%	21.9%	25.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
HCCS Student Pop Mix	35.9%	23.7%	24.0%	14.9%	0.3%	1.3%

Year Three 1999-2000

Measure A.2b Percentage of minority students (African-American, Hispanics, Native American)*

Baseline Data 1996-97	B	H	N Am.
HCCS Minority Students*	24.4%	20.7%	0.3% (THECB Data)

Year One 1997-98	B	H	N Am.
HCCS Minority Students*	24.4%	21.0%	0.3% (THECB Data)

Year Two 1998-99	B	H	N Am.
HCCS Minority Students*	24.4%	21.3%	0.3% (HCCS Estimated)

Year Three 1999-2000

Measure A.3 Faculty-staff-administration Fall population mix vs. student population mix

Baseline Data 1996-97	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	372/63.4%	130/22.2%	45/7.7%	40/6.8%
Admin	68/56.7%	27/22.5%	22/18.3%	3/2.5%
Staff	207/36.5%	203/35.8%	119/21.0%	38/6.7%
Student Pop	39.8%	22.7%	22.5%	14.9%

Year One 1997-98	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	381/63.2%	133/22.1%	47/7.8%	42/7%
Admin	58/55.2%	23/21.9%	21/20.0%	3/2.9%
Staff	261/34.7%	266/35.3%	178/23.4%	50/6.6%
Student Pop	38.8%	23.0%	23.2%	15.0%

Year Two 1998-99	W	B	H	A/O
Faculty	391/63.7%	133/22.7%	49/8.0%	41/6.7%
Admin	58/55.2%	28/26.7%	16/15.2%	3/2.9%
Staff	272/34.0%	289/36.1%	188/23.2%	54/6.7%
Student Pop	35.9%	23.7%	24.0%	16.5%

Year Three 1999-2000

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Measure A.4	**Number students receiving financial aid and scholarships**		
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
20,378	20,674	19,190	
Measure A.5	**Percentage of students who are economically disadvantaged***		
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
27.6% (THECB Data)	26.4% (THECB Data)	26% (HCCS Estimated)	
Measure A.6	**Percentage of students who are academically disadvantaged***		
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
34.6% (THECB Data)	36.3% (THECB Data)	38% (HCCS Estimated)	
Measure A.7	**Percentage of students who are self-declared ADA**		
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
6% (THECB Data)	5% (THECB Data)	5% (HCCS Estimated)	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR B. STUDENT PROGRESS/STUDENT SATISFACTION

Measure B.1 Percentage of remedial students (tested and untested) who pass TASP (all three sections)*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS = 12.87% Statewide Average = 15.57% (THECB Data)	HCCS = 11.05% Statewide Average = 13.69% (THECB Data)	HCCS = 11% (HCCS Estimated)	

Measure B.2 Percentage of Fall semester course completers*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
77.39% (THECB Data)	77.01% (THECB Data)	77.84% (THECB Data)	

Measure B.3 First time Fall semester students who return for Spring semester

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
60.1% (HCCS Data)	67.2% (HCCS Data)	69.7% (HCCS Data)	

Measure B.4 Associate degrees and certificates awarded*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
1,086 Degrees 1,102 Certificates 2,188 Total Awards (IPEDS Data)	1,040 Degrees 1,096 Certificates 2,136 Total Awards (IPEDS Data)	1,072 Degrees 771 Certificates 1,843 Total Awards (IPEDS Data)	

Measure B.5 Student evaluation of overall quality of education

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	Above average = 64.8%	Above average = 64.1%	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR C. WORKFORCE PROGRAMS

Measure C.1 Job placement of graduates/program completers

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
HCCS 85.00% State Avg. 79.72%	HCCS 85.4% State Avg. 83.2%	HCCS 86.6% State Avg. 84.0%	

Measure C.2 Employers' satisfaction with competence of program completers

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	In Progress	In Progress	

Measure C.3 Program completers' satisfaction with education preparation

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	In Progress	In Progress	

Measure C.4 Licensure exam pass rates*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Percentage of students who pass a licensure exam = Not Available Cosmetology=80% Court Reporting=28% Emergency Medical/Paramedic=89% Interpreter for the Deaf=75% Law Enforcement Academy=76% Nurse Aide=100% Nurse, Licensed Vocational=79% Nurse, Registered=88% Occupational Therapy Assistant=100% Physical Therapy Assistant=71% (THECB Data)	Percentage of students who pass a licensure exam = 83% (THECB Data) Cosmetology=86% Court Reporting=38% Emergency Medical/Paramedic=91% Fire Protection (Arson Investigator & Inspector)=93% Fire Protection (Structure)=99% Nurse Aide=95% Nurse, Licensed Vocational=86% Nurse, Registered=86% Occupational Therapy Assistant=100% Physical Therapy Assistant=77% (THECB Data)	Percentage of students who pass a licensure exam = 80% (HCCS Estimated) Aircraft Mechanic (Powerplant, Airframe, & Gen)=88% Cosmetology=86% Court Reporting=10% Emergency Medical/Paramedic=80% Fire Protection (Arson Invest & Inspector)=100% Interpreter for the Deaf=50% Nurse Aide=96% Nurse, Licensed Vocational=88% Nurse, Registered=90% Occupational Therapy Assistant=100% Physical Therapy Assistant=65% (THECB Data)	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDICATOR D. UNIVERSITY TRANSFER

Measure D.1 Number of students who transfer to senior institutions*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
7,406 Students (THECB Data)	7,607 Students (THECB Data)	7,629 Students (THECB Data)	

Measure D.2 Grade point averages of students who transfer vs. grade point average of noncommunity college (native) students at selected institutions

Baseline Data 1996-97			*Year One 1997-98*			*Year Two 1998-99*			*Year Three 1999-2000*
Type Transfer Institution	HCCS Transfers	All Transfers	Type Transfer Institution	HCCS Transfers	All Transfers	Type Transfer Institution	HCCS Transfers	All Transfers	
Large	2.84 GPA	2.80 GPA	Large	2.80 GPA	2.80 GPA	Large	2.79 GPA	2.80 GPA	
Medium	2.42 GPA	2.44 GPA	Medium	2.29 GPA	2.46 GPA	Medium	2.26 GPA	2.40 GPA	
Local	3.01 GPA	3.07 GPA	Local	3.01 GPA	3.07 GPA	Local	3.17 GPA	3.21 GPA	

Measure D.3 Graduates' satisfaction with academic preparation

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
None	In Progress	In Progress	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR E. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Measure E.1 Enrollment in ABE, GED, ESL, workplace literacy			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Total annual enrollees = 19,481 (includes CBOs (Community Based Organization)	Total annual enrollees = 21,244 (includes CBOs (Community Based Organization)	Total annual enrollees = 15,021 [includes CBOs (Community Based Organization]	
Measure E.2 Number of companies and number of individuals served by industry contract training			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Number industry training contracts = 95	Number industry training contracts = 179	Number industry training contracts = 163	
Measure E.3 Completion of noncredit courses for personal interest			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Noncredit enrollment = 17,826	Noncredit enrollment = 17,210	Noncredit enrollment = 17,264	
Measure E.4 Successful completion of Workforce CEU courses			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Course completers = 22,020	Course completers = 22,815	Course completers = 21,625	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR F. CULTURAL AND CROSS-CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Measure F.1 Number of international education partnerships			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Total Partnerships =19	Total Partnerships =19	Total Partnerships =11	
Measure F.2 Cultural and cross-cultural activities sponsored by the college for students, faculty, staff and community			
Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
143 activities	213 activities	150 activities	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

INDICATOR G. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Measure G.1 Leased/owned space per FTE

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Leased=28.55 sq ft per FTE Owned=46.32 sq ft per FTE (HCCS Data)	Leased=27.51 sq ft per FTE Owned=47.07 sq ft per FTE (HCCS Data)	Leased=24.73 sq ft per FTE Owned=48.33 sq ft per FTE (HCCS Data)	

Measure G.2 Percent of contact hours taught by full-time vs. part-time faculty*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Contact hrs taught by ft faculty = 46.3% (HCCS Data)	Contact hrs taught by ft faculty = 46.6% (HCCS Data)	Contact hrs taught by ft faculty = 43.9% (HCCS Data)	

Measure G.3 Total amount of restricted funds

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
Total restricted funds = $31,760,789 (HCCS Data)	Total restricted funds = $33,904,684 (HCCS Data)	Total restricted funds = $38,252,042 (HCCS Data)	

Measure G.4 HCCS expenditure per FTE student

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
$6,040	$6,737	$6,094	

Measure G.5 Percentage of expenditures for institutional support versus total current funds expenditures*

Baseline Data 1996-97	*Year One 1997-98*	*Year Two 1998-99*	*Year Three 1999-2000*
9.27% (HCCS Data)	9.7% (HCCS Data)	9.17% (HCCS Estimated)	

NOTE: Unless the measure specifies "Fall," performance is based on annual data; and, unless otherwise specified, data are based on credit enrollment.
***This is a Legislative Budget Board (LBB) performance measure.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART III.
REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES FOR 1998-99

Program review is a major component of HCCS' comprehensive system of planning and evaluation. It is a systematic process for continuous improvement of the educational programs at the Houston Community College System, requiring all programs within the institution to be reviewed on a cyclical basis. The review is a method of evaluating educational quality and effectiveness and the extent to which educational goals are being achieved in each unit. The review process is separate from but linked to decision-making, planning, and budget processes.

The purpose of program review is to internally and externally examine, assess and evaluate the educational programs to ensure compliance with the institution's mission, to improve programs, to document successful efforts, and to comply with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) criteria. The results of the review process will serve as a tool for continuous program improvement and impact the planning and budgeting activities at both the institution and program level.

In developing the academic and workforce self-study instruments, critical success indicators, measures and standards were identified as the basis for evaluating program effectiveness. The standards are derived from SACS criteria, THECB institutional effectiveness requirements, and HCCS' *Vision for the Future* (goals and objectives for 1997-2000). The five critical success indicators identified for evaluating these programs are planning, student outcomes, curriculum and instruction, faculty, and resources.

The comprehensive review process for the workforce and academic educational programs was piloted in Summer and Fall of 1998; a review of all 70 workforce and 28 academic programs is scheduled to be completed by Fall 2000. All programs will continue to be reviewed on a cyclical (4-year) basis.

In Summer 1998, nine Workforce programs completed their self-evaluations and received on-site visits. The *1997-98 Institutional Effectiveness Report* summarized the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement for the nine pilot programs. During the 1998-99 academic year, the institution took actions to improve the effectiveness of these programs. Also an additional 24 programs successfully conducted reviews and developed plans to address their deficiencies. There is much evidence of change as a result of the review process. Significant among these are the development and implementation of surveys to measure customer satisfaction (student and employer), the identification and closure of programs no longer viable (Business Occupations was changed to Continuing Education), and the allocation of faculty positions and funds to programs based on the prioritizing of needs. One specific example is the reallocation of funds by Northeast College administration to the Electronic Engineering Technology program for the upgrade of equipment to business/industry standards, which enabled the program to maintain its accreditation with TAC/ABET.

Also, during Fall 1998, the academic disciplines conducted pilot reviews. By the end of 1998-99, 12 disciplines completed and submitted self-evaluations to the Vice Chancellor for Educational Development. These reports were sent forward to the Deans' Council for review; the Council completed 10 reviews and are in the process of working with the appropriate disciplines to develop improvement plans based on the results of the evaluation.

At the end of the 1998-99 academic year, nearly 50 percent of the academic and workforce programs had conducted self-studies and reported their findings. Many of these reports have been presented to the Deans' Council for review. As a result, the instructional administration is more cognizant of the strengths and weaknesses of the various disciplines and programs and more involved in bringing about changes to improve their effectiveness.

Academic Program Review Status For 1998-1999

Discipline	Course Rubric	Program Leaders	Scheduled Review	Review Status				Improvement Plan
				College Studies Complete	System Summary Complete	Deans' Review Complete	Notebook Submitted to VCED	In Progress
Anthropology	ANTH	A. Bragdon	Fall 98	✓	✓		✓	
Art	ARTS	C. Millis	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Biology	BIOL	J. Hunter	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Chemistry	CHEM	M. Outlaw	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Developmental English	ENGL	C. Renfro	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Developmental Math	MATH	W. Neal	Summer 98	✓	✓		✓	
Developmental Reading	GUST, READ	K.L. Moran	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Drama	DRAM	E. Muth	Fall 99					
Economics	ECON	Z. Saderion	Fall 99					
English	ENGL	H. Orman	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
English as a Second Language	ENGL	M. Picus	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Foreign Languages	CHIN FREN GERM JAPN RUSS SPAN	C. Jacobs	Fall 99					
Geography	GEOG	J. Robinson	Fall 99	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Geology (with GIS)	GEOL	A. Cate	Spring 2000					
Government	GOVT	L. Gonzalez	Fall 98					
History	HIST	H. Bodner	Fall 98					
Home Economics (Nutrition)	HOEC	D. Lima	Fall 99					
Intensive English	ESOL	D. Ross	Fall 99					
Mathematics	MATH	T. Sever	Fall 98					
Philosophy	PHIL	S. Goll	Fall 98					
Physical Education	PHED	C. Dodson	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Physics	PHYS	D. Akpanumoh	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Psychology	PSYC	D. Boyd/J. Hsu	Fall 98					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discipline	Course Rubric	Program Leaders	Scheduled Review	Review Status				Improvement Plan
				College Studies Complete	System Summary Complete	Deans' Review Complete	Notebook Submitted to VCED	In Progress
Communication Science/ Broadcast Journalism	COMM	S. Whitebird	Spring 2000					
Dance	DANC	D. Quanaim	Spring 2000					
Music	MUSI MUAP MUSB	V. Lootens	Fall 99					
Sociology	SOCI	S. Menon	Spring 2000					
Speech	SPCH	B. Ferreira	Spring 2000					

Workforce Education Program Review Status for 1998-1999

Program	Course Rubrics	College	Department Chair	Scheduled Review	Review Status		Improvement Plan
					Self-Study Complete	On-Site Visit Complete	Filed and In Progress
Air Conditioning and Refrigeration	AIRC	CEN	Klaus Petereit	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Aviation Maintenance Technology	AIRM, AERM	CEN		Fall 99			
Building Maintenance Trades	COMT	CEN	Joe Dobes	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Building Science Technology	BSCT	CEN	Joe Dobes	Fall 99			
Child Care/Child Development	CDEC, CHID	CEN	Joan Wyde	Fall 99			
Civil and Manufacturing Technology	CIVT, CNBT, ENTC, EPCT	CEN	Jimmy Vu	Fall 99	Program Closed		
Commercial Art	CART	CEN	Glen Edwards	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Consumer Electronics Servicing	CELS	CEN	Rudy Rodriguez	Summer 98	✓	✓	Program Closed
Court Reporting	CTRP	CEN	Paula Witt	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Credit Management	CREM	CEN	Earl Smith	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Culinary Services	CHEF	CEN	Henry Pile	Fall 99			
Fashion Design	FASD, FASI	CEN	Kay King	Fall 99			
Fashion Merchandising	FASM	CEN	Kay King	Fall 99			
Finance Management	FINA	CEN	Earl Smith	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Graphic Arts/Printing Technology	GRAA, GRPH	CEN	Robert Garza	Fall 99	Program Closed		
Hotel & Restaurant Management	HRMA	CEN	Sizat Moradi	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Industrial Electricity	ELEC	CEN	Max Saravia	Summer 99			
Interior Design	INTD	CEN	Kay King	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Interpreting/Transliterating Technology	ITTD	CEN	Shirley Pacetti	Fall 99			
Legal Assistant	LEGA	CEN	Doug Wilson	Fall 99			
Major Appliance Repair	MAPR	CEN	Klaus Petereit	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Manufacturing Engineering Technology	MAET, INMT, ENTC	CEN	Jimmy Vu	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program	Course Rubrics	College	Department Chair	Scheduled Review	Review Status		Improvement Plan
					Self-Study Complete	On-Site Visit Complete	Filed and In Progress
Manufacturing Processes & Machine Operations	MACS, MCHN	CEN	Jimmy Vu	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Photographic Technology	PHOT	CEN	Glenn Edwards	Summer 99			
Physical Fitness Technology	PFIT	CEN	Caprice Dodson	Summer 99			
Travel & Tourism	TRAV	CEN	Ezat Moradi	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Welding	WELD, WLDG	CEN	James Owens	Summer 99			
Auto Body Repair	ABRT, HMVM, SGER	NE	George Washington	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Automotive Mechanics	AUTO, CAAP, RVRT	NE	Michael Shoebrek	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Business Administration/ International Business	IBUS	NE	Linda Koffel	Summer 99			
Business Administration/ Management	BUSI, BUSM, BUSG, HRPO	NE	Linda Koffel	Summer 99			
Business Administration/Marketing Management & Research	MKTG, MRKG	NE	Linda Koffel	Fall 99			
Business Administration/Materials Management	BMGT, MMTD, COTD	NE	Linda Koffel	Fall 99			
Diesel Engine Mechanic and Repairer	DIEM, DEMR	NE	George Washington	Fall 99			
Drafting/Design Technology	DRFT	NE	Frank Ortiz	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Electronic Engineering Technology	ELET	NE	Morteza Sameei	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Fire Protection Technology	FIRE, FIRS, FIRT	NE	Steve Jahnke and/or Jonelle Scott	Fall 99			
Law Enforcement	CRIJ	NE	Al Barringer	Fall 98	✓	✓	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program	Course Rubrics	College	Department Chair	Scheduled Review	Review Status		Improvement Plan
					Self-Study Complete	On-Site Visit Complete	Filed and In Progress
Risk Management and Insurance	INSU, INSR	NE	Linda Koffel	Fall 99	Program Closure		
Safety & Environmental Technology	SAET	NE	Ken Hernandez	Fall 98	✓	Program Closure	
Audio & Recording Technology	AUDT	NW	Scott Gehman	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Cosmetology	COSM	NW	Hilda Sustaita	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Horticulture	HORT	NW	Seth Knight	Fall 99			
Music	MPER, MACP, MUSB	NW	Aubrey Tucker	Summer 99			
Veterinary Paramedic	VPAR	NW	Pamela Huebner	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Video Recording Technology	VIDT	NW	Scott Gehman	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Associate Degree Nursing	NURS	SE	Roger Kline	Fall 99			
Business Technology	WORD, RECM, OFFT	SE	Dr. Johnella Bradford	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Dental Assisting	DENA	SE	Rosalva Perez	Fall 99			
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	DMST	SE	Teresa Rice	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Emergency Medical Technician	EMMT	SE	George Hatch	Fall 99			
Health Information Technology	HITN	SE	Carla Tyson	Fall 99			
Human Services Technology	MENH	SE	Richard Rosing	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Licensed Vocational Nursing	VOCN	SE	Dorothy Collins	Fall 99			
Medical Assistant	MEDA, MDCA	SE	Tomye Geringer	Summer 99			
Medical Laboratory Technician	MELT	SE	Mary Beth Murphy	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Nuclear Medicine Technology	NUMT	SE	Glenn Smith	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Occupational Therapy Assistant	OCTA	SE	Linda Williams	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Pharmacy Technician	PHAR	SE	Liz Johnson-Wilroy	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Physical Therapist Assistant	PHTA	SE	Georgianna Wilson	Fall 99			
Radiography	RADT	SE	Teresa Rice	Fall 98	✓	✓	✓
Respiratory Care Technician	RESC	SE	Mimi Bartel	Fall 99			
Respiratory Therapist	REST	SE	Ralph Bartel	Fall 99			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program	Course Rubrics	College	Department Chair	Scheduled Review	Review Status		Improvement Plan
					Self-Study Complete	On-Site Visit Complete	Filed and In Progress
Surgical Technology	SURT	SE	Christine Castillo-Sainz	Summer 99			
Accounting	ACCT, ACNT	SW	Marina Nathan	Fall 98	✓	✓	
Broadcast Technology	VIDP	SW	Larry Mers	Fall 99			
Computer Information Science & Computer Science Technology	CSCI	SW	Tony Beckman	Summer 99			
Geographic Information Science	GISG	SW	Ozzie Nye	Fall 99			
Real Estate	REAL	SW	Dorothy Lewis	Summer 98	✓	✓	✓
Technical Communication	TECC, GRPH	SW	Lloyd Schuh	Fall 99			